REMARKS

This Amendment is in response to an Office Action mailed July 25, 2007. In the Office Action, claims 1-3, 18-19, 21, 23-25 and 28-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102. Claims 20, 22, 26 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103. Claims 20 and 28 have been amended. Claims 31-35 have been added. Currently, claims 1-3 and 18-35 are outstanding.

Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

Examiner's Interview

On October 4, 2007, the undersigned attorney conducted a telephone conference with the Examiner. In the telephone conference, the undersigned attorney discussed the lack of teachings of multiple processors performing decode operations on different streams of data. Moreover, the undersigned attorney discussed the operations of the audio and graphics processor of Shimizu and the lack of decode processing being performed by both of these processors on separate data streams (first data stream, second data stream) that include video and audio.

Tentatively, the Examiner agreed to reconsider the allowability of these claims based on a better understanding of the prior art and the invention as claimed, and to contact the undersigned attorney if, after review, such claims are not in condition for allowance. The Examiner is thanked for his thorough analysis.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-3, 18-19, 21, 23-25 and 28-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Shimizu, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,609,977). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection because a *prima facie* case of anticipation can not be established based on the amendment presented above.

As the Examiner is aware, to anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim. "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." Vergegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ.2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the . . . claim." Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co., 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ.2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

For instance, with respect to claims 1 and 28, Applicant has previously added additional limitations to clarify the contents of the first stream data. These limitations are added to more clearly identify that both the first stream data and the second stream data include both video data and audio data. As set forth in the Office Action, the first stream data is construed as one or more commands responsive to signaling from hand controller(s) (52). *See Page 4 of the Office Action.* The commands are transmitted from a main processor (110) to a graphics and audio processor (114), hereinafter referred to as a "GA processor". *See col. 6, lines 53-66 of Shimizu.*

First, Applicant respectfully submits that the commands transmitted from the main processor (110) do not constitute the first stream data as claimed. Second, the main processor (110) does not decode the first stream data (commands) routed over the communication bus (i.e. the bus between the main processor (110) and the graphics and audio processor 114). In contrast, the main processor (110) merely outputs 3D graphics and audio commands to the GA processor (114). These commands control the data processing conducted at the GA processor (114).

One distinction between the claimed invention and the teachings of Shimizu is the presence of two or more processors, such as CPU (111) and stream processor (115) according to one embodiment of the invention, that collectively work to decode the stream data. As claimed, the first processor (CPU) is adapted to decode the first stream data (video data and audio data) sent over the communication bus while the second processor is adapted to decode the second stream data (video data and audio data) that is sent from the drive device without use the communication bus. Both the first and second stream data include video data and audio data, because one of the objectives for the claimed invention is to achieve better efficiency. The more data is compressed, the more processor time is needed to decode the data. Therefore, the first and second processors share such burdensome processes of decoding video data and audio data.

In contrast, Shimizu teaches the use of a single processor (GA processor 114) that is controlled by main processor (110) to decode images and audio with the assistance of a video encoder (120) and audio codec (122). *See col., 6, line 53 – col. 7, line 3 of Shimizu.* There is no teaching or suggestion of dedicated decode operations for one type of data stream routed over the communication bus and another type of data streams routed without use of the communication bus.

Hence, in light of the amendments, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the §102(e) rejection as applied to claims 1-3, 18-19, 21, 23-25 and 28-30.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 20 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimizu in view of Witt (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0109005). Moreover, claims 26-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimizu in view of Ochiai (U.S. Patent No. 6,757,482). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection because a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established.

As the Examiner is aware, to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify a reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. *See MPEP §2143; see also In Re Fine, 873 F. 2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q.2D 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988).*

Applicant respectfully submits that a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established because the combined teachings of the cited references fail to describe or suggest all of the claim limitations. Moreover, based on the dependency of claims 20, 22, 26 and 27 on independent claim 1, believed by Applicant to be in condition for allowance, no further discussion as to the grounds for traverse is warranted. Applicant reserves the right to present such arguments in an Appeal is warranted. Withdrawal of the §103(a) rejection as applied to claims 20, 22, 26 and 27 is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: October 09, 2007

By_____

William W. Schaal
Reg. No. 39,018
Tel.: (714) 557-3800 (Pacific Coast)